UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,406	02/05/2007	Birger Hansson	05822.0329USWO	5505
23552 MERCHANT &	7590 04/10/200 & GOULD PC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 2903	}	CERNOCH, STEVEN MICHAEL		
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3752	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commence	10/560,406	HANSSON, BIRGER					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	STEVEN CERNOCH	3752					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period in Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 M</u>	larch 2009						
,	s action is non-final.						
<i>i</i> =	/ 						
·—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application.	4) 🔀 Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.						
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>2</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.	·						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>12 December 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority document	 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 						
2. Certified copies of the priority document							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)							
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:							

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 and 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettit et al. (US Pat No 6,293,476 B1) in view of Miyauchi et al. (EP 1,361,045 A1).

Re claim 1, Pettit et al. shows a spray nozzle (Fig. 2) for spraying fountain solution or the like on a roll in a printing machine, the spray nozzle comprising a spray opening (Fig. 2, 12) at a base plateau (14) at a front end of the spray nozzle, comprising the spray opening opens on a protrusion (15) protruding from the base plateau in the spray direction of the nozzle, and hence gives a flat spray (column 1, line 24).

Pettit et al. does not show a spray opening that's oblong.

However, Miyauchi et al. does teach a spray opening that's oblong (Fig. 2, 13).

Art Unit: 3752

Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the motivation to modify the outlet of Pettit et al. with the outlet of Miyauchi et al. as it serves to wash away residual fluid (col. 8, lines 9-11).

Re claim 3, Pettit et al. shows sloping sides connect slope rearwardly from the base plateau (Fig. 3, 50).

Re claim 6, Pettit et al. shows the sloping sides, the spray opening, the base plateau and the protrusion are enclosed by enclosing walls (Fig. 2, 20 & 30).

Re claims 4, 5 and 7, Pettit et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the protrusion protrudes about 2mm over the base plateau, the protrusion front area of about 2 by 2mm and the sloping sides slope with an angle of about 45 degrees. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make the protrusion protrude about 2mm over the base plateau, the protrusion front area of about 2 by 2mm and the sloping sides slope with an angle of about 45 degrees, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Re claim 8, Pettit et al. discloses the claimed invention except for wherein the nozzle is manufactured from a uniform piece of material. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to manufacture the nozzle from a uniform piece of material, since it has not disclosed that manufacturing the nozzle from a uniform piece of material solves any stated problem or

is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a nozzle manufactured from a non-uniform piece of material.

Re claim 9, Pettit et al. discloses the claimed invention except for wherein the nozzle is manufactured from stainless steel. It would have have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to manufacture the nozzle from stainless steel, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-9 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEVEN CERNOCH whose telephone number is (571)270-3540. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Len Tran can be reached on (571)272-1184. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/560,406 Page 5

Art Unit: 3752

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. C./ Examiner, Art Unit 3752

/Len Tran/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3752